

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ **BLACK BORDERS**
- ☐ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- ☐ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- ☐ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- ☐ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- ☐ **LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- ☐ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- ☐ **OTHER:** _____

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/965,001	09/27/2001	Sanaa F. Abdelhadi	AUS920010903US1	2725
7590 Mr. Volel Emile P.O. Box 202170 Austin, TX 78720-2170			EXAMINER RAMPURIA, SATISH	
			ART UNIT 2124	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 08/16/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/965,001	Applicant(s) ABDELHADI ET AL.	
	Examiner Satish S. Rampuria	Art Unit 2124	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 September 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the application filed on 09/27/2001.
2. Claims 1-6 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

- ✓ 4. ^{1-6 are} Claims ~~1-6~~ are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Publication No. 2004/0139430 to Eatough et al. (hereinafter called Eatough) in view of US Patent No. 6,151,023 to Chari (hereinafter called Chari).

Per claim 1:

Eatough disclose:

- A method of interfacing an existing system management user interface with a new system management software utility running on a computer system in a network (page 2, paragraph 23 “existing systems... require learning a new interface or packaging all application... before changing the package... using one consistent interface for all package formats and operating systems, the user does not have to learn multiple interfaces and methods for managing packages” and page 1, paragraph 15 “the consistency allows all X-packages 120 to be managed in a single user interface”), said

computer system having a network address and page 1, paragraph 11 “MVPM system... include a distribution management server”), said method comprising the steps of:

- providing a set of specifications for interfacing the new user interface with said new software management system utility (page 1, paragraph 13 “package importer 108 receives the vendor-specific software package... a new package document referred to as an X-package 120... the X-package 120 may include an Extensible Markup Language (XML) package document”);

Eatough does not explicitly disclose using a cross-referencing table to cross-reference the network address of the computer system with the new system management software utility.

However, Chari discloses in an analogous computer system using a cross-referencing table to cross-reference the network address of the computer system with the new system management software utility (col. 14, lines 37-48 “MIB Manager Module 402 invokes the MIB Section Module's "retrieve data" function... MIB Section Module... used to retrieve MIB data contained in a table or organized in a group of variables... MIB Section Module 404 invokes the SNMP Module's GET NEXT function... continues to retrieve data until there are no more variables in the MIB table” and Figs. 7-12B and related discussion).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the method of retrieving the information from the table until all variable met as taught by Chari into the method of system management software in multivender environment as taught by Eatough. The modification would be obvious because of one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to map the network address/variable for the

application deploying on the network server/computer in server management application to improve efficiency and provide less costly productivity as suggested by Chari (col. 6, lines 34-48).

Per claim 2:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, Eatough disclose wherein said cross-reference table includes code to translate communications between said existing user interface and said new system management software utility (page 2, paragraph 21 “The process includes importing a vendor-specific software package 102 using an XML vendor package template 110 at 200”).

Eatough does not explicitly disclose cross-reference table.

However, Chari disclose in an analogous computer system cross-reference table (col. 12, lines 24-26 “Network Map Window Module 422... discover the number of servers... in the network...” and col. 14, lines 37-48 “MIB Manager Module 402 invokes the MIB Section Module's "retrieve data" function... MIB Section Module... used to retrieve MIB data contained in a table or organized in a group of variables... MIB Section Module 404 invokes the SNMP Module's GET NEXT function... continues to retrieve data until there are no more variables in the MIB table” and Figs. 7-12B and related discussion).

The feature of cross-reference table would be obvious for the reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 1.

Claim 3 is the computer program product claim corresponding to method claim 1 and rejected under the same rational set forth in connection with the rejection of claim 1 above.

Claim 4 is the computer program product claim corresponding to method claim 2 and rejected under the same rational set forth in connection with the rejection of claim 2 above.

Claim 5 is the system claim corresponding to method claim 1 and rejected under the same rational set forth in connection with the rejection of claim 1 above.

Claim 6 is the system claim corresponding to method claim 2 and rejected under the same rational set forth in connection with the rejection of claim 2 above.

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

The following patent is cited to further show the state of the art with respect to a pluggable user interface.

US Pub. No. 2003/0156552 to Banker et al.

US Patent No. 6,591,272 to Williams et al.

US Patent No. 2002/0116698 to Lurie et al.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Satish S. Rampuria whose telephone number is 703-305-8891.

The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 am to 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kakali Chaki can be reached on (703) 305-9662. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Satish S. Rampuria
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2124
08/09/2004

Kakali Chaki

KAKALI CHAKI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100